

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
OXFORD DIVISION

KATHRYN P. WITTNER

PLAINTIFF

VS.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:19-CV-3-DMB-JMV

RUTH P. SCHWARTZ, ET AL.

DEFENDANTS

ORDER STAYING CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

Local Uniform Civil Rule 16(b)(3)(B) provides that “a motion asserting a jurisdictional defense... stays the attorney conference and disclosure requirements and all discovery, pending the court’s ruling on the motion, including any appeal.” L.U. Civ. R. 16(b)(3)(B). Whether to permit discovery on issues related to the jurisdictional motion... [is a decision] committed to the discretion of the court, upon a motion by any party seeking relief.” L.U. Civ. R. 16(b)(3)(B).

Defendants have filed a motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Doc. #24. Accordingly, staying discovery in this case is appropriate at this time.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the aforementioned proceedings are hereby **STAYED**, pending a ruling on the jurisdictional motion. Defendants shall notify the undersigned magistrate judge within seven (7) days of a decision on the motion and shall submit a proposed order lifting the stay.

SO ORDERED this, April 10, 2019.

/s/ Jane M. Virden

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE